

THE WASHINGTON POST and TIMES HERALD  
A 2 Monday, June 1, 1959 ...

45 R25  
397

# Refugee Bill Would Give Attorney General Discretion

By Elsie Carper  
Staff Reporter

Legislation introduced by Rep. Francis E. Walter (D-Pa.), chairman of the House Immigration Subcommittee, would give the Attorney General broad powers in admitting refugees to this country.

His proposal now before the Subcommittee, is far more sweeping than legislation sent to Congress early last week by the Justice Department.

The Walter measure permits the entry of an unlimited number of refugees above immigration quotas while the Administration bill sets a 10,000-a-year ceiling unless there is an emergency similar to the Hungarian uprising. Under such a circumstance the President by proclamation could admit a maximum of 68,000 refugees.

Both measures authorize the Attorney General on recommendation of the Secretary of State to parole into the United States refugees who have fled from Communist persecution to a free country or refugees from the Middle East who cannot return home because of their race, religion or political opinion. After two years the refugees would be eligible for permanent residence status.

The procedure is similar to that under which some 38,000 Hungarians were admitted.

## Faces Refugee Problem

Walter aimed his resolution solely at the refugee problem and said that in his view the Attorney General now has the discretionary power to admit refugees. The resolution would reinforce that power and let the Administration know that it was the intent of Congress that it be exercised.

The Administration bill is part of a general revision of the basic immigration law and incorporates changes that Walter in the past has resisted. The measure, like other bills pending before House and Sen-

tees, would increase immigration quotas by 65,000 a year, and set up quota pools for Europe, Africa, Asia and the Pacific Ocean areas.

Prompting new legislation this year is United States participation in World Refugee Year beginning July 1. Proposed by Great Britain and sponsored by the United

## UN Today Starts World Refugee Year

Reuters

GENEVA, May 31—An international campaign to ease the plight of an estimated 2 million refugees throughout the world starts Monday with the official opening of United Nations-sponsored World Refugee Year.

A total of 59 governments, scores of voluntary agencies and hundreds of individuals will pool their resources in a huge humanitarian effort to offer new lives to thousands of many races who exist without homes or even countries.

States, World Refugee Year was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly last December by a vote of 59 to 9 with only the Communist bloc in opposition.

## 2 Million Need Help

Purpose of the year is to awaken people everywhere to the unsolved needs of refugees and to mobilize private and government support to assist them.

According to the United Nations count, there are more than two million refugees who need assistance. In Europe alone there are 100,000 living outside camps and 32,000 living in 140 camps in Austria, Germany, Greece and Italy. Children make up one fifth of the camp population

House conference on refugees that he was aware of the blank check nature of his resolution.

Congress, though, would maintain a check on the operation by reviewing reports from the Attorney General. The special authority also could be quickly terminated by a resolution passed by either the Senate or the House.

Walter said he was steering clear of what he described as "the numbers game" of how many refugees wanted admission or should be allowed to enter each year.

He found no virtue, either, in "crash programs" designed to wipe out the refugee problem. There is no permanent solution, he said, "as long as we live in a world divided between the free and the slave."

Sometimes, he pointed out, the influx of refugees into the free world is but a trickle and sometimes it is a flood like the one that took place during the Hungarian uprising.

Walter, who in the past has had pretty much the final say on what immigration legislation clears the House, said he is hopeful that the resolution would permit the United States to negotiate with other free nations to take their share of the refugees.

## Soviet Playwright Gets Order of Lenin

Reuters

LONDON, May 31—Soviet novelist and playwright Leonid Maksimovich Leonov has been awarded the Order of Lenin for the second time.

In 1957 he won the prize for his controversial novel, "Russian Forest," and now he has been awarded it again to mark his 60th birthday and "his outstanding services to the development of Soviet literature," Moscow radio reported yesterday.

A 10

Tuesday, April 5, 1960 THE WASHINGTON POST

# House Votes to Admit 5000 DPs

By Vincent J. Burke  
United Press International

The House yesterday passed a bill that would admit about 5000 refugees in European camps to this country during the next 27 months.

The measure, passed by voice vote, now goes to the Senate. It was considered under a procedure barring amendments.

Chairman Francis E. Walter (D-Pa.) of the House Immigration Subcommittee pre-

those eligible actually would enter the United States.

No mention was made during debate of President Eisenhower's plea for legislation doubling present quotas, which limit the entry of immigrants to about 150,000 a year.

The President also called for special legislation to admit refugees from other parts of the world, not just Europe, as the U. S. contribution to "world refugee

The bill passed yesterday had languished for almost a year in the House Immigration Subcommittee. It was revived by Walter, its sponsor, after the President sent his message to Congress 19 days ago.

Spokesmen for the United States Committee for Refugees said in a statement that the House passed bill was an "indispensable first step" toward the refugee legislation

the Senate to liberalize its terms.

Walter has predicted, however, that Congress will not pass any other immigration legislation this year. Aided by the conservative-dominated House Rules Committee, he could block any attempt by the Senate to liberalize the bill.

The House bill would permit the United States to join other nations in helping to resettle a "residue" of refugees, mostly from Iron Curtain countries, who still remain in European camps.

The United States could admit 25 per cent of the number admitted by other countries. They would become permanent residents after two years and could apply for naturalization five years after admission.

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6685

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Powell        | Rooney       | Taylor         |
| Quigley       | Rostenkowski | Teller         |
| Randall       | Santangelo   | Thompson, N.J. |
| Ray           | Saund        | Toll           |
| Reece, Tenn.  | Schwengel    | Vanik          |
| Reuss         | Sheppard     | Wallhauser     |
| Rhodes, Ariz. | Short        | Willis         |
| Rhodes, Pa.   | Siler        | Withrow        |
| Riley         | Smith, Iowa  | Wolf           |
| Rivers, S.C.  | Staggers     | Yates          |
| Roberts       | Sullivan     | Zablocki       |
| Rodino        | Taber        | Zelenko        |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 297 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 36 on March 28, 1960, I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## RESETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee bill, House Joint Resolution 397, which would enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees. This is World Refugee Year. The United States, by Presidential proclamation, is one of 69 nations which has fixed upon this year as the time when at long last we must find some permanent solutions for the refugee problem.

However, I regard this resolution as only a step in the right direction. I would much prefer an overall facing up to the problem of refugees throughout the world, especially in these days when the victims of Communist oppression continue to flee from behind the Iron Curtain to freedom in Western Europe. We must establish legislation on a permanent basis, which will enable our Government intelligently and compassionately to meet its fair share of responsibility for refugee relief.

I have introduced the administration bill which specifies that the President may direct the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to parole into this country annually upwards of 10,000 "refugee-escapees" and "unsettled hard-core refugees." If the President should proclaim that an emergency exists, a greater number may be admitted. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General would be given discretion to provide such measure of relief as is consistent with our world responsibility working closely with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This should be the goal of refugee legislation. House Joint Resolution 397, the bill we are now discussing, is limited in that it

restricts eligibility to refugees who now fall under the United Nations mandate. This limitation precludes any relief for certain other refugees principally in the Middle East and the Far East. There are no specific provisions for the emergency situations such as we met following the Hungarian revolt.

This resolution confines itself to diminishing the residue of unsettled refugees now in United Nations camps located in Europe. What is ignored is the constant flow of new refugees who continue to flee tyranny in many corners of the globe. It amounts to short-term sedation in the hope that the problem will go away. I submit that what is needed is not sedation but surgery. We must consider this problem in its full scope. We must allow for complete flexibility to meet the problem today as well as emergency situations that may arise in the future.

The problem is fully recognized but let us not be satisfied with a minimal solution.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this bill again raises an old, old question, which has been before us many times in the past. Some of our people in our districts, wanting to be helpful, sponsor someone who wishes to come in from some other country. Our people pay their way here, provide jobs for them, living quarters, and everything that is necessary to live as does the ordinary American. Then the refugee pops up and away he goes. Often when located on a farm, he will stay maybe a week or so. Then he will find that farm work requires more time, the hours are longer, than those in a town or factory. He learns he can get more money in the city or in the factory. So he is through with his sponsor.

Just recently, within the last week, there was a situation where a family rather moderate circumstances sponsored a refugee and gave the family an opportunity. They spent something like \$900 to get him here. That gentleman was not content to just move and to leave the farm.

But read the story.

Here is the complaint. It is a familiar one:

Sodus, Mich., March 12, 1960.

The Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have recently talked to Representative HARRY LITOWICH who suggested I write to you. I am Doris Handy, wife of John Handy, Sodus, Mich., whom I think you know.

I am writing about an immigration problem—a man and wife whom we feel should not be allowed to become American citizens—in fact I wonder how bad one can be before deportation.

This man's name is Werner Stritzel—sometimes called Peter Stritzel. He arrived from Germany on the SS *Neptune*, pier 88, West 18th Street, New York, on March 28, 1955. He and his family arrived in Niles, Mich., the following day. I met them and brought them to our farm. Stritzel's name

had been given to Mr. Handy through our minister and a parishioner of his, as a farm person anxious to come to the United States. Since we had already sponsored several Latvian families, we agreed to again lend a helping hand and sponsor him. It was a very bad mistake on our part.

After doing everything possible in an attempt to be fired, since he did not want farm work, yet was supposed to stay 2 years—he got his wish. He had wantonly destroyed farm property—refused to work when needed, used our car without permission—even threatened to kill my husband. John finally fired him the early part of July 1955.

His debt to us at that time was \$983.68. We tried in vain to get our money. He held no job long enough for wage attachment. After many calls and a year's lapse of time he sent us \$100. Further attempts at settlement resulted only in sneers and insults. Finally we went to a lawyer who thought us overcritical but started an agreement with Stritzel to repay at \$5 a month. None was ever received.

He lost one position on moral charges, he lies, he steals.

In the fall of 1958 he was jailed for passing bad checks. Just before jailing he was forced by police to pay the Streamline Trailer Co. \$212 after attempting to pass them a bad check. He was finally released for lack of evidence. We knew nothing of this until too late to appear against him. The police took \$1,000 from him when arrested, and though the court ordered the money returned, still no debts were paid. He owes many others including the Memorial Hospital and the Nowlen Lumber Co.

The lawyer who cleared him told me before he knew of my interest that he advised him to leave the State. Later the lawyer denied this. Stritzel now lives in Wisconsin. The last address I had was 613 Vista Drive, Caledonia, Wis.

Though we would like our \$800, there is something more important. He will be eligible for citizenship papers this spring. I think this should be prohibited. He is a very clever crook and lies so well many are "taken in" and wish to help until they, too, get burned.

On two occasions I talked to immigration officials from Detroit who were at the St. Joseph courthouse for naturalization procedures. Both just laughed at me saying it was my word against Stritzel's and any complaint would do no good.

Mr. Handy wrote to Bureau of Immigration, Investigation Section, 3770 East Jefferson, Detroit, and received no answer at all.

Since I started this letter he has gone into bankruptcy; further evidence I should say, of a nondesirable citizen.

Is there any place where we can get action or does one more clever crook become a citizen of our United States?

Sincerely yours,

DORIS G. HANDY  
Mrs. John Handy.

Mr. WALTER. I know of no way that a sponsor can guarantee that a person will remain in their place of employment. After all, the law that would require that would be unconstitutional. So that the only thing that a sponsor has to rely on is the good faith of the person to whom he is extending a great deal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, we have had several cases of a similar nature. Some seem to make a business of soliciting our people to accept sponsorship. Some moved over to Kalamazoo where they are now based and can get more clients, and they get maybe \$25 or \$50 or \$100 to bring in a refugee and locate him with a sponsor and no sooner he

and family hit the farm or the job and away he goes. What can you do about that? Can we do anything at all to end that practice?

Mr. WALTER. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that everybody who comes to the United States under the provisions of this resolution is subject to the provisions of the basic code. Under the code, where an alien commits a crime within 5 years after his admission into the United States, he is deportable. That is provided for in the code and it is a felony under the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right if we can find an offender, but he keeps moving around committing crimes here and there before he goes to another State. I want to thank the gentleman for the wonderful service he has rendered along this line of trying to correct and prevent some of these evils.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to protest the change in legislative procedure whereby the House started early in this session to consider bills under suspension of the rules. I do not like this procedure and I want to again protest. I can see no reason for bypassing the Committee on Rules and the normal, established procedures of the House of Representatives by bringing up so many bills under suspension.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I might state to the gentleman that this bill was on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand that it was on the unanimous Consent Calendar, and it seems now to have become the rule that if a bill is objected to on the Consent Calendar, then it goes under suspension.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must state to the gentleman from Iowa that that statement is not correct. Thousands of bills are on the Consent Calendar and are objected to and they never are taken up under suspension of the rules.

Mr. GROSS. I will say, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that the records will show that in the past several sessions, the House started with suspensions so early in the session, and in the number of bills that we have had under suspension this year. I do not think the record will bear it out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, of course, knows that the rules of the procedure of the House provide for special legislative days on which days the Speaker may recognize Members to suspend the rules.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly it is not a violation of the rules. I am protesting the bypassing of the Rules Committee with suspensions so early in the session when there has been plenty of time for the normal procedure.

If I may ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, what sort of a precedent are

we setting if any, with this bill? What is going to happen to the million refugees still in camps in the Middle East? Are they any different from these people; and if so, what is the difference?

Mr. WALTER. I would only mention one difference. It would, of course, be futile to pass a resolution authorizing to admit people under the provisions of our basic law if we knew that they could not obtain a sponsor in this country. I am certain that Hong Kong Chinese would be unable to find sponsors in the event the U.S. Congress should do, what I do not think it would ever do; that is, find that these people are the kind of people we need in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman speaking of individual sponsors or sponsors in the nature of nations?

Mr. WALTER. Under the legislation under consideration in conjunction with the basic statute there must be an individual sponsor for each person guaranteeing against such person becoming a public charge. All that this legislation does is to provide that those people who are under the mandate of the United Nations, either 5,500 or 7,000, somewhere in between, become eligible to enter the United States by virtue of the fact that they are unable to return to their own country because of fear of persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds.

Mr. GROSS. And this has very little meaning from the standpoint of a legal sponsor.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know what the gentleman means, except that there must be an individual sponsor in each case; whether this is legally meaningful or not, I do not know. We hope that it is. I know there are confusing court decisions, but within our constitutional limits, we have tried to make it mean something.

Mr. GROSS. Was there not a recent court ruling which held that a sponsor was not legally responsible for an individual who might be brought in?

Mr. WALTER. That is precisely what I have in mind. A New York court in a California case, I believe, held that the guarantee that a person would not become a public charge was not a legal contract but merely a moral obligation. Shockingly enough, a religious organization has set up the defense that this is only a moral obligation, and therefore they do not feel they are required to pay for this person who did become a public charge at considerable expense to the people of California.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman does not think this is setting a precedent and that the United States will not be called upon by the United Nations to take care of the million refugees now in camps in the Middle East? He does not think that is going to happen?

Mr. WALTER. Participating organizations today are doing as much in this situation as they possibly can. For example, the National Catholic Welfare Conference has instituted a perfectly magnificent program. They have provided Hong Kong refugees with machinery for the manufacture of macaroni. Somewhat they are thereby changing the rice diet of the Chinese people. Through

the use of surplus wheat and this machinery to make macaroni, in addition to providing food, the NCWC has established a new business for refugees in that section of the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have done far more than our share in taking care of refugees. I simply cannot support a bill of this nature, which I am convinced establishes something of a precedent. I am fearful that we are going to be called upon next to take care of a million refugees now in camps in the Middle East. I cannot understand why so many other nations of the world are not joined in the program proposed in this bill. Where are all the rest of the nations throughout the world? Are they not interested in World Refugee Year and in taking care of these people?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of California. If the gentleman will note the amendatory language in this particular resolution I think he will see that possibly we are starting a precedent which I think is very good; in other words, instead of just passing a World Refugee Year measure to allow the Attorney General to permit as many refugees to enter this country as the Secretary of State asks him to, we place some important restriction by which we, first, cannot take into the United States any refugees except those under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees between now and July 1, 1962, and, second, not more than 25 percent of the total number that the other countries of the world take in. That will come down, actually, to 20 percent of the residue. Actually we may take in a hundred; we may have to take in 25, or 125, but always only 25 percent of what the others will be taking.

This is the first time that we have had some language that will stop these organizations that pressure and pressure the Congress to bring in millions of people, in what they call a resettlement program; this language stops that. Now we may end up and close these camps and this refugee problem in the course of 2 years, by July of 1962. We are giving these other countries 2 more years to join in our continuous effort.

Let us get rid of this problem. I think this bill contains language that the gentleman and I can accept. I say I can accept it. I think the gentleman will find that this is good legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for the excellent work that he has done with respect to immigration in the past. I regret that I cannot agree with him on this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 397.

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6687

Mr. Speaker, while I support the presented resolution, I feel that there are certain inadequacies which merit discussion.

Certainly, in keeping with the World Refugee Year and the President's message which specifically refers to this problem, it is proper that legislation of this nature receive consideration and action.

This resolution, while affording temporary relief, does not solve the refugee problem on a permanent basis. It is here where the need exists for legislation which will be able to cope with a problem which will always be with us as long as forced rule is imposed upon nations within the Soviet orbit. However, refugees exist in other areas and for reasons which make them also bona fide. This resolution, first of all, discriminates against bona fide refugees by taking recognition of only those who are within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. As such, it will prevent many others, who are bona fide refugees, for entrance. This seems to me to be a severe drawback to this resolution. Another, even more important, is the lack of any provision to allow for rapid admission of refugees who are the result of a precipitous upheaval. The recommendation for power by proclamation for the President to cope with such an immediate crisis is not considered in this resolution. I believe this to be a serious omission.

Unlike the 10,000 refugees to be admitted each year, under the President's program, this resolution provides for 25 percent of those who are within the U.N. High Commissioner's mandate. A number considerably less, plus the fact that certain groups are being discriminated against, seems to be a contradiction of what should be done for a problem which is not only current, but which will be presented to us, it seems, for many years hence.

These refugees cannot be allowed to remain unnoticed whether we like it or not. Many valuable contributions to the stream of daily American life can be made by these people.

I have received many letters from Americans who are deeply concerned with the seemingly insoluble problem of the refugees. These people are motivated by the sincere desire for the compassion worthy of a nation like ours and in accord with the basic principles of its foundation. An act to offer relief to these people would exemplify America's continued sincerity during World Refugee Year and at any time this humane need exists in the world.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like simply to remark with respect to the concern of the gentleman from Iowa, that the bill now has the 25 percent feature embodied in it; that is, the rest of the nations of the free world must take 75 percent.

The fact also remains that any who are taken into this country under this bill are carefully screened before and

after entry to the United States, and do not come in on a permanent basis in the first place. So we have added safeguards in the resolution in that respect.

Also I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that a proposal originally considered by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality included practically all the refugees of the world. After very, very careful studies of this matter our subcommittee limited it to those who were under the mandate of the High Commissioner of the United Nations. So I think that in part the subcommittee has answered some of the fears the gentleman from Iowa expressed here today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I am disturbed about one thing, and that is what is the difference between this and resettlement? I would like to ask either the chairman or the ranking member of the committee, What is the difference between accepting these refugees under this bill and accepting them under a proposed bill for further increases in immigration quotas? Is not the end result exactly the same? They get their citizenship, and their limitations are about the same.

Mr. MOORE. Exactly the same. The only difference is that here we authorize the admission of a proportionate number of certain class of aliens, to wit, refugees under the mandate of the United Nations.

Mr. WIER. So in both cases they get citizenship until such time as they can be returned. This is merely resettlement.

As I understand it, they are admitted, and they can be permitted to obtain citizenship?

Mr. WALTER. Under this legislation and under the permanent law, they become eligible for citizenship after they have been residents of the United States for a period of 5 years.

Mr. WIER. That applies to immigration, too?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 397 and commend the committee on the practicality of this proposal, and the humanitarian principles that are so obvious in this area. It is certainly commendable that our Nation participates in the resettlement of refugee-escapees by admitting a proportionate number of refugees into the United States. The procedure to adjust the number of refugees to be admitted in proportion to the number admitted by countries other than the United States is a practical solution.

We have always taken a great deal of pride in regarding our country as a

haven for people seeking freedom in a land of opportunity. Certainly, history will bear out the thesis that the waves of immigrants that have reached this country throughout its entire history have been a worthwhile contributing factor to our political, economical, and social development. We know from experience that the vast majority of immigrants to this country become responsible, law-abiding citizens who are assets to the communities in which they settle and to the Nation at large. Certainly it is fitting, with this tremendous history of contribution that immigrants and refugees have compiled, that the United States coordinate with the various worldwide bodies in accepting a reasonable share of refugees on a sound basis. The fact that this legislation has the support of the Department of Justice and the Department of State is an indication of its soundness.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the members of the Judiciary Committee for their hard work in connection with this bill and to compliment them for their great understanding of the plight of refugees who are in need of the humanitarian approach towards solving the great international problem that they present.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 397 which enables the United States to participate in the resettlement of alien refugee-escapees who are now under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The Congress cannot show a more sincere manifestation of this Government's desire to actively participate in the World Refugee Year than by the adoption of this resolution which would admit to this country a proportionate number of refugees, up to 25 percent of those admitted by other non-Communist countries.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Immigration Subcommittee points out that an internationally concerted effort is being made this year to find resettlement opportunities in the countries of the free world for these refugees. I am sure my colleagues agree with me that we in the United States have room for many of these refugees. We should welcome them to our free shores during this World Refugee Year and thus do our part to help close several of the refugee camps that are still operating in Europe 15 years after the end of World War II.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with many of my colleagues in support of the House Joint Resolution 397, which will enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of alien refugees and escapees who are presently under the mandate of



the United Nation's High Commissioner for Refugees.

While I would like to go further than what this resolution allows, I believe it is a step in the right direction.

We in America have always opened our hearts to those who are in need of our help.

Let us welcome them to our shores; let us renew their faith in their fellow man; yes, let us take them to our bosom so that America can demonstrate, once again, our concern for the oppressed.

This resolution will make more meaningful the immortal words written by Emma Lazarus inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,  
Send these the homeless, the tempest  
tossed, to me;

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

—*New Colossus* (Inscription  
for the Statue of Liberty).

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the House joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the House joint resolution was passed.

#### WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 431.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the smuggling of narcotics and the illicit use of narcotics are serious national problems; and

Whereas the inability to achieve both a tighter control over the unauthorized importation of narcotics into this country and over the illicit use of narcotics by addicts and others in this country is causing increased nationwide concern; and

Whereas the traffic in, and addiction to, narcotics are serious problems affecting the Federal Government and the several States; and

Whereas narcotics contribute to juvenile delinquency and greatly add to the expenses of law enforcement and the cost of running the courts and judicial system of our country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics, patterned after previous White House conferences. Such conference should be broadly representative of persons dealing with such problems at the State and local levels, and shall also include—

(1) an appropriate number of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(2) representatives of the Departments and agencies of the Federal Government concerned with such problems, including, but not limited to, the Department of Justice; Department of the Treasury; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Department of State; and be it further

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House that this narcotics conference should undertake to recommend—

(1) ways and means of securing more uniformity in State and Federal enforcement of narcotic statutes and their penalties, and to delineate more clearly Federal, State, and local authority;

(2) the substance of a directive clearly defining procedures and jurisdictions in this field;

(3) machinery for a continuing consultation between the United States and other nations, in order to obtain the maximum international cooperation, working through existing United Nations facilities, as well as engaging in unilateral contact and consultation when the facts or situation so require;

(4) a proposal for a Federal-State hospitalization program for the purpose of protecting the narcotics addict from the inevitable results of his addiction, and to protect society from the danger and expenses of the uncontrolled actions of the addict; and

(5) such other matters as will contribute to the solution of the national problem of narcotics; and be it further

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House that the White House Conference on Narcotics should submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its recommendations with respect to the problems relating to the traffic in, and addiction to, narcotics, and any other results of its deliberations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. The purpose of House Resolution 431 is to express the sense of the House that the President call a White House conference on narcotics problems. This resolution was one of a group of resolutions which were the subject of a hearing before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

This resolution concerns the unpleasant fact that our country has a serious problem in connection with illicit narcotics and their control. There is a clear-cut need for the study of the problem on the Federal, State, and local level in order that there may be the practical planning and the development of means for the control of illicit narcotic drugs and the elimination of the problems they produce. A White House conference such as that urged in House Resolution 431 would serve to bring together representative people from all over the Nation and from all levels of government who are concerned with these problems. Such a conference would provide a forum where these representatives could make known their experience and thinking on the subject, and thereby provide the basis for a concerted effort on all levels of government for an assault on the problems stemming from illicit narcotics.

The resolution provides that such a conference should make definite recommendations as to ways for securing uniformity in State and Federal enforcement of narcotics statutes and penalties, and the delineation of enforcement authority; the definition of procedures and jurisdictions between governmental agencies; consultation between our country and other nations; a Federal-State hospitalization program, and any other recommendations which the conference might formulate.

As I stated previously, the purpose of this resolution is to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the problems created by the smuggling of narcotics and their illicit use are so great and widespread, and the health and moral standards of large areas of the country are being so detrimentally affected as to reach epidemic proportions in certain areas, that a White House Conference on Narcotics will be an effective and forceful medium for coordinating a harmonized and united assault on the scourge.

By means of such a conference, employing the prestige of the President, the collective experience and thinking on the subject by those who are directly occupied with the problems can be coordinated.

Through such coordination problems concerning disparity of legislation in the various States, international cooperation, participation by law enforcement and health officers, and the treatment of addicts can be resolved. And a continuing and coordinating program can be instituted and sustained.

The need for such action has indicated the growing aspect of this menace despite all present efforts. The Commissioner of Narcotics reported on February 15, 1960, that California had 6,471 known narcotics. The California State Board of Correction estimates that in 1959 there were 10,000 narcotics in that State alone. The Los Angeles County medical association describes the situation as "a public health and safety problem."

The hearings before the subcommittee established the necessity for such a conference notwithstanding the fact that an Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics functioning since 1954 made a report with certain recommendations in 1956. The conditions described to the subcommittee as prevailing, prevalent, and propagating were, in the opinion of the committee sufficiently serious and of immediate concern to all areas of the country to justify the emphatic action which such a conference would produce.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who is the author of this legislation. I might also say that there are many companion bills of a like tenor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] for his very clear explanation of this resolution, and also the members of the committee for the very fine hearings which were conducted on the need for this resolution and on the extent of the narcotics problem as a serious national situation which affects not only the older members of our population but particularly the youth of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to take this opportunity to commend most highly my colleagues from California [Mr. H. ALLEN SMITH and Mr. JOE HOLT], who, in a most statesmanlike and bipartisan manner, explained the need for this legislation and with great patience have undertaken to do what they can to bring about full cooperation and coordination by the Federal Government